

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No. 10/004,576

Reply to Office Action of February 10, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to this Amendment, claims 1-19 were pending in the application.

Claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of dependent claims 2, 5, and 6, which are canceled by this Amendment.

Independent claim 10 is amended to include the limitations of dependent claim 11, which is canceled.

Independent claim 15 is amended to include the limitations of dependent claim 19, which is canceled.

After entry of the Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 7-10, and 12-18 remain for consideration by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

In the February 10, 2005 Office Action, claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,816,864 ("Deuser"). This rejection is traversed based on the following remarks.

As amended, claim 1 is directed to a computer system for automating communications between client devices and service provider devices, and to this end, the system includes a service provider device with a conversion and connection mechanism for receiving streamed service requests and converting the streamed service request to a request document. The service provider also includes a response generator adapted to create a response document from a service response created by a target service, where "the response document and the request document are in a formatted structure used by the service provider and by the client device." Deuser fails to show a service provider having the claimed configuration, and hence, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

More specifically, the Office Action cites, in its rejections of claims 5 and 6, Deuser at col. 8, lines 22-32 for teaching the response generator of the service provider now of claim 1 and that the response document and the request document "are in a formatted structure used by the service provider and by the client device."

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No. 10/004,576

Reply to Office Action of February 10, 2005

Applicants disagree with this interpretation of the teaching of Deuser. In col. 8, lines 22-32, Deuser teaches that an XML servlet layer 325 processes a Java object and creates an XML document that is later used by a browser servlet layer 310 to return an HTML page for display on a client display. There is no teaching here of a response document and a request document that both have a particular formatted data structure used both by a client device and a service provider. Hence, there is no teaching or suggestion of the provision of a conversion and connection device and a response generator in a service provider as called for in claim 1. As a result, Deuser fails to support a rejection of claim 1 under §102.

Claims 3, 4, and 7-9 depend from claim 1 and are believed allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Independent claim 10 is directed to a method for use in a service provider system that includes converting a streamed service request from a client machine and converting the service request into a request document. The converting includes "verifying the client machine is an acceptable source of service requests and verifying validity of the request document by comparing included data types in the request document with expected data definitions." Deuser fails to teach or suggest verifying the validity of a service request in this manner, and hence, claim 10 is not anticipated by Deuser.

More particularly, the Office Action rejected claim 11 based on the teaching of Deuser at col. 2, lines 44-47 and at col. 6, lines 32-37. At col. 2, lines 44-47, Deuser teaches using an LDAP security model which fails to teach or suggest verifying the validity of a document "by comparing included data types in the request document with expected data definitions" but instead teaches the use of extensible authentication to allow proof of identity. At col. 6, lines 32-37, Deuser teaches information "about the client's data request includes the action that the client is requesting, the data area name, or field name, that the client is wishing to retrieve or store, the type of data corresponding to the data area name (such as

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No. 10/004,576
Reply to Office Action of February 10, 2005

integer or string), and a textual representation of a data value (when the client is requesting to store data)." At this citation, Deuser fails to discuss or suggest validating a request document by comparing included data types with expected data definitions. Hence, Deuser fails to anticipate each and every element of claim 10 and as a result, fails to support an anticipation rejection of claim 10.

Claims 12-14 depend from claim 10 and are believed allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Claim 12 further includes limitations similar to that of claim 1 and as a result, the reasons for allowing claim 1 are applicable to claim 12.

Independent claim 15 is directed to a method for use in a service provider client-server network. The method includes "generating a service request document having a first form", "determining a data transfer protocol based on a service provider device identified in the service request document", and "converting the service request document into a service string having a streaming form according to the data transfer protocol." Deuser fails to teach determining a data transfer protocol based on a service provider device identified in a service request document and then converting the service request document into a service string based on the determined data transfer protocol. Hence, Deuser cannot support a rejection of claim 15.

In rejecting claim 19, the Office Action cites Deuser at col. 8, lines 33-55, but at this citation Deuser is describing a dataflow diagram shown in Figure 4. Deuser at this citation and elsewhere does not teach processing a service request to determine a data transfer protocol to be used in creating a streaming form of the request or that such protocol is determined based on the service provider. Instead, Figure 4 simply discusses creation and use of an XML document and later an HTML web page but provides no discussion of streaming data transfer protocols or the selection of such protocols based on a service provider identified in a service request document. Because at least these limitations of claim 15 are not shown in

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No. 10/004,576
Reply to Office Action of February 10, 2005

Deuser, claim 15 is believed in condition for allowance over this reference.

Claims 16-18 depend from claim 15 and are believed allowable at least for the reasons for allowing claim 15. Further, claim 17 includes limitations similar to claim 1, and as a result, the reasons provided for allowing claim 1 are believed equally applicable to claim 17.


Conclusions

In view of all of the above, it is requested that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

No fee is believed due for this submittal. However, any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

April 13, 2005


Kent A. Lembke, No. 44,866
Hogan & Hartson LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(720) 406-5378 Tel
(720) 406-5301 Fax